

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 5, 11, 26, 28-31 and 33-34 have been amended. Claims 7-10, 12-25, 27 and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-6, 11, 26, 28-30 and 32-35 are presented for examination.

### **35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection**

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 26-31 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26-31.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 11 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
“first part” in line 3 should be – first party--.

Claims 1, 11 and 26 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection of claims 1, 11 and 26.

Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities:  
The machine-readable medium of claim 26 in line 1 should be – The machine-readable medium of claim 27--.

Claim 26 have been amended. Claim 27 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 30 properly depends from claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection of claim 26.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-6, 11 and 26-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cook, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,922,776 (“Cook”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:

registering a first party and a second party with a database at a server, wherein the first part is registered as a party relying on a digital certificate of the second party;

receiving a request to revoke the digital certificate of the second party after registering the first party;

authenticating the request in accordance with a pre-defined authenticating policy associated with the digital certificate of the second party, and generating an authorization certificate by a revoker of digital certificates;

sending the authorization certificate to the first party, the authorization certificate including a revoker certificate associated with the revoker;

revoking the digital certificate in accordance with a revocation policy; and initiating communication with the first party to indicate that the digital certificate has been revoked, wherein the communication includes notifying the first party that the digital certificate has been revoked, wherein the notification is further sent to other parties registering with the database as relying on the digital certificate of the second party.

Cook discloses a “scalable system for notification of a change in condition of an electronic certificate is provided. The system includes a network of servers capable of providing notification of changes in conditions of electronic certificate to an unlimited number of users. The system includes a first server comprising a detection module and a notification module. The system having at least one server capable of actively monitoring and detecting changes in conditions of a certificate. Other CAP servers in the system may and/or may not actively monitor electronic certificates at the same time. That is, these CAP servers may actively monitor conditions of electronic certificates at the same time they play passive roles (e.g., not monitoring the electronic certificates for which they will be notified of changes from another CAP server).” (Abstract).

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, in pertinent part, recites “receiving a request to revoke the digital certificate of the second party after registering the first party . . . authenticating the request in accordance with a pre-defined authenticating policy associated with the digital certificate of the second party, and generating an authorization certificate by a revoker of digital certificates . . . sending the authorization certificate to the first party, the authorization certificate including a revoker certificate associated with the revoker . . . revoking the digital certificate in accordance with a revocation policy” (emphasis added). Cook does not reach or reasonably suggest at least these limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 its dependent claims.

Claims 11 and 36 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 36 and their dependent claims.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: /March 27, 2008/

/Aslam A. Jaffery/

Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980